

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT
(Sacramento)

In re the Marriage of THAO NGUYEN and
THOMAS NGOC TRAN.

THAO NGUYEN,

Respondent,

v.

THOMAS NGOC TRAN,

Appellant.

C063068

(Super. Ct. No.
09DV01528)

Thomas Ngoc Tran (Husband) appeals from an order of protection, ordering Husband to remain 100 yards away from Thao Nguyen (Wife) and Wife's parents, as well as Wife's home, job, and vehicle for one year. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

Husband has elected to proceed on a clerk's transcript. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.121.) Thus, the appellate record does not include a reporter's transcript of the hearing in this matter. This is referred to as a "judgment roll" appeal.

(*Allen v. Toten* (1985) 172 Cal.App.3d 1079, 1082-1083; *Krueger v. Bank of America* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 204, 207.)

The limited record we have establishes only that on August 26, 2009, the trial court issued the order from which Husband appeals.

On appeal, we must presume the trial court's judgment is correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) Thus, we must adopt all inferences in favor of the judgment, unless the record expressly contradicts them. (See *Brewer v. Simpson* (1960) 53 Cal.2d 567, 583.)

It is the burden of the party challenging a judgment to provide an adequate record to assess claims of error. (*Ketchum v. Moses* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 1122, 1140-1141.) An appellant must present an analysis of the facts and legal authority on each point made, and must support the analysis with appropriate citations to the material facts in the record. If an appellant fails to do so, the argument is forfeited. (*County of Solano v. Vallejo Redevelopment Agency* (1999) 75 Cal.App.4th 1262, 1274; *Duarte v. Chino Community Hospital* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 849, 856.)

When an appeal is "on the judgment roll" (*Allen v. Toten, supra*, 172 Cal.App.3d at pp. 1082-1083), we must conclusively presume evidence was presented that is sufficient to support the court's findings. (*Ehrler v. Ehrler* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 147, 154.) Our review is limited to determining whether any error "appears on the face of the record." (*National Secretarial*

Service, Inc. v. Froehlich (1989) 210 Cal.App.3d 510, 521; see also Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.163.)

These restrictive rules of appellate procedure apply to Husband even though he is representing himself on appeal. (*Leslie v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance* (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 117, 121; see also *Nelson v. Gaunt* (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 623, 638-639; *Wantuch v. Davis* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 786, 795.)

Father contends the trial court erred in issuing the order of protection. Providing no legal analysis or citations to legal authority, Husband has forfeited his claim on appeal. (*Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246, fn. 14; *Badie v. Bank of America* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 779, 784-785.)

Husband's claim fails in any event because, without a reporter's transcript of the hearing on the order of protection, we "must conclusively presume that the evidence is ample to sustain the [trial court's] findings.'" (*Ehrler v. Ehrler*, *supra*, 126 Cal.App.3d at p. 154.) We find no error on the face of this record.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

We concur: _____ HULL _____, Acting P. J.

_____ ROBIE _____, J.

_____ BUTZ _____, J.